

CHRIS T. RASMUSSEN, ESQ.
Nevada Bar No.:007149
RASMUSSEN LAW P.C.
520 S. Fourth Street
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
Tel: (702) 384-5563
Fax: (702) 550-7031
Attorney for Defendant

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

FREDDIE LAMONT PRENTISS,

Defendant.

Case No. 2:18-cr-00243-JCM-BNW

STIPULATION AND ORDER TO
CONTINUE SENTENCING

IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED, by and between Joshua Brister, Assistant United States Attorney, and Chris T. Rasmussen, Esq., counsel for Freddie Prentiss, that the sentencing currently scheduled for August 24, 2022 at 11:00 a.m., be vacated and set to a date and time convenient to this Court but no sooner than ninety days.

This Stipulation is entered into for the following reasons:

1. The parties agree to a continuance;
2. Defendant is currently in custody;
3. Counsel for the Defendant has spoken to the Defendant and the Defendant has no objection to this continuance;
4. Denial of this request could result in a miscarriage of justice;
5. For all the above- stated reasons, the ends of justice would best be served by a continuance of the sentencing date by ninety days.

1 7. This is the fifth request for continuance.

2 DATED this 18th day of August, 2022.

3
4 /s/ Chris T. Rasmussen

 /s/ Joshua Brister

5 _____
6 CHRIS T. RASMUSSEN, ESQ.
 Attorney for Defendant

 JOSHUA BRISTER
 Assistant United States Attorney

CHRIS T. RASMUSSEN, ESQ.
Nevada Bar No. 007149
RASMUSSEN LAW P.C.
520 S. 4th Street
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
T: (702) 384-5563
ctr@rasmussenlaw.com

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

vs.

FREDDIE LAMONT PRENTISS,

Defendant.

Case No.: 2:18-cr-00243-JCM-BNW

FINDINGS OF FACT AND
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

FINDINGS OF FACT

Based on the stipulation of counsel, and good cause appearing, the Court finds that:

1. The parties agree to a continuance;
2. Defendant is currently in custody;
3. Counsel for the Defendant has spoken to the Defendant and the Defendant has no objection to this continuance.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. Denial of this request would result in a miscarriage of justice;
2. For all the above-stated reason, the ends of justice would best be served by a continuance of the sentencing date for ninety days.

